

## Seattle Monorail Review Panel Meeting Notes for July 21, 2003

<u>Panelists</u>	<u>City Staff</u>	<u>SMP Staff</u>	<u>SMP Consultants</u>	<u>Public</u>
Steve Sheehy, Co- Chair Dan Foltz Nancy Henderson Jack Mackie Cary Moon Vlad Oustimovitch Nic Rossouw Mimi Sheridan Paul Tomita Blaine Weber	Maureen Colaizzi  Layne Cubell Kathy A Dockins Vince Lyons Ethan Melone Vanessa Murdock John Rahaim Cheryl Sizov	Alan Hart  Suanne Pelley Rachel Ben-Shmuel	Heather Johnston, Place  Grace Kim, Place Roxanne Williams, NBBJ	Cindy Barker  Geof Logan Patricia Stambor

The meeting began with introductions all around: first the Panel and staff and then the audience. Steve Sheehy chaired the meeting as Don Royse was absent.

### Business

#### Approval of Minutes from July 7, 2003

Kathy Dockins asked for clarification on two points in the meeting minutes from the July 7 meeting: the name of a street at one of the Monorail stations and which Panel member had seconded the second motion. The street is "Commercial" and Paul was the panelist. Jack moved that the minutes be approved with these two clarifications. Nic Rossouw seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### Review of Agenda

One item was added to the agenda: that of the architect selection process for station design. Cheryl Sizov presented the issue, noting that per the request of Panel members, SMP staff is asking for up to three panel members to participate in the selection process. The stations in question are West Seattle, Ballard, and Lander. SMP staff, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, distributed a handout further explaining the process. SMP has a roster from which the consultants will be chosen. Cheryl pointed out that there will be an evening presentation at a forum on Wednesday, August 27. Those Panelists who volunteer to be a part of the subcommittee must commit to attending that presentation as well as consultant interviews the week of September 2 - 5 (as the 1<sup>st</sup> is a holiday). Questions from Panel members followed.

#### Discussion

- What is the relationship between the teams that have been hired already, including Via Suzuki, and these consultants yet to be selected? *Via Suzuki is overseeing station design work for the Dravus and Mercer station, Ballard stations, and the Operations Center. Some of the urban design consultants are also pre-qualified to move onto specific station designs (Hewitt, ZGF, and NBBJ). We wanted to hear from the neighborhoods, so that's why we're having this forum on August 27.*
- Sometimes consultants are precluded from going forward in the process. Is that the case here? *No.*
- How does the community process tie in with who else is involved? *There will be two community members and one MRP member on the interview panel for each of the packages. Public comments received at the forum will be part of the selection process.*
- What dates are we looking at for selection? *The first week of September.*

- What is the timing of the RFP process? *If a consultant ends up teaming with someone who's not on the roster, they'll have to submit their qualifications. The shortlisting will be done prior to the forum on August 27.*
- So SMP is doing the shortlisting. Yes.
- One of the areas is West Seattle. Is this supposed to be done by neighborhood, e.g. should Vlad be one of the volunteers because he lives in West Seattle? *No, not necessarily. The volunteers don't have to be from the neighborhoods in question.*

Nic expressed interest in volunteering, but first needs to determine if the consultants have sub-consultants to be sure there is no conflict of interest with his firm. Steve requested that staff send a reminder e-mail with the dates in question so potential volunteers could check their calendars. Maureen said she would take care of it. Nancy, Dan, Blaine and Vlad all expressed interest in participating.

- Why are Mercer and Dravus pulled out as representative stations to design first? They don't accurately represent any of the stations that will be downtown. *We wanted to choose two different station types.*
- Do we answer to the MUP process? *These stations are simpler.*
- Yes, that's my point. It might be better to include a station that is simpler and one that is more difficult in order to get a sense of the whole range of issues. The type of station isn't as critical as the location.

Maureen requested that we stick to business; Jack volunteered to e-mail his question to the rest of the Panel for discussion, and it was agreed that staff would pursue an answer to the question with SMP staff before the next MRP meeting.

## **City's Planning/Urban Design Staff**

*Cheryl Sizov, DCLU*

*Maureen Colaizzi, DCLU*

Cheryl stated she wanted the opportunity to formally introduce her team now that everyone is on board, and indicated that she already knows many Panel members from work with the Light Rail Review Panel and the Design Review Program. She said she is enthusiastic about the opportunity to work with the Panel, City staff, and SMP staff on this project.

Maureen Colaizzi, Vanessa Murdock, Scott Dvorak, and David Graves introduced themselves as the Monorail Review Panel Coordinator, the Station Area Planning lead, and the Station Area Planners, respectively. The team will be working together on design review, station area planning, and general design collaboration. They may have funds to hire consultants to help with some of the tougher issues. The Seattle Planning Commission will be the lead for reviewing the station area planning work; although the MRP may also review aspects of station area planning related to design.

Cheryl observed that she's seeing good things at the MRP meetings, including broad participation among members, teamwork, and a willingness to express differing viewpoints. She sees this as an opportunity for the public to see us wrestle with the issues. One thing she would like to see is clearer movement from discussion to action and indicated that she, Maureen, and John have discussed ways to fine-tune the meetings toward that end. She also noted that because the schedule is moving so quickly, this group doesn't have the luxury of being disorganized. Even though it may seem time-consuming to do additional teambuilding at this point, it may ultimately be a more effective use of time than not doing so! She'd like the Panel members to consider participating in some teambuilding exercises to help ground the discussions, and will work with Maureen to suggest some ideas. Other

process improvements include a room set-up that makes it easier for the public to see and hear the Panel; temporary nametags (permanent nametags coming soon); and refreshments. Let us know if you also have thoughts on how to improve the review process.

Steve asked if the Panel had any questions for staff, which they did not. He also brought up another item not on the agenda: Ethan's memo and the review schedule. He met with staff earlier this week to discuss these and requested that SMP provide the Panel with a schedule at the next meeting (August 4). All Panelists agree this is acceptable, including Jack & Cary who previously expressed the most concern about the subject being on the agenda at a future meeting.

## **Proposed Land Use Code Amendments**

*Diane Sugimura, DCLU*

*John Skelton, DCLU*

Diane Sugimura began the discussion. The Land Use Code changes are being proposed in order to make the Monorail a permitted use. The project has been approved by the voters, and it will be built, but since there was no Monorail when the code was written changes have to be made to permit its construction. DCLU wants to address the Monorail's needs, as well as the City's and the neighborhoods'. The City wants the regulations in place well in advance so the process is efficient and effective.

The code is being developed to allow for flexibility. People have asked about control and oversight. Council is a primary part of that (as they approve transit alignment and station locations), and the Panel plays a major part as well due to their advisory role in reviewing the guideway and station designs. There are some technical/functional reasons to allow for flexibility; another reason for flexibility is to ensure design excellence in each individual neighborhood. Diane completed her discussion.

Steve said that he wanted to be sure to leave as much time as possible for questions from the Panel and members of the public. He asked the Panel if they wanted to discuss the issue and provide a formal recommendation today or address the issue in another forum.

John Skelton pointed out that the hearing at which Council would decide how to handle the code changes is July 22nd at 2:00pm. Jack was concerned that the only opportunity for members of the public to express their views was at a meeting on a workday in the middle of the afternoon. Diane said there had been an informational meeting at Seattle Center the evening of July 8, and Councilmember Nick Licata had put together a smaller group for further opportunity for discussion. John Skelton clarified the code changes further by explaining that DCLU is trying to put together a framework for reviewing and permitting the monorail project by addressing development standards such as height limits, setbacks and floor area ratios. Code requirements are generally written to address the development characteristics of traditional buildings on lots. The Land Use Code never envisioned a monorail or its stations. Any variation granted in development standards would have to be consistent with the Council's approval of the monorail alignment and facilities.

As the design of the monorail is developed, the Monorail Review Panel will be advising both City Council and the City Departments (DCLU and SDoT) on the development of design guidelines or standards. These proposed code amendments will provide the authority for the Department Directors' to waive or modify design standards to the extent necessary to meet the intent of the guidelines.

There have been a lot of questions regarding timing of these code amendments. The public wonders, "Why now? Can't it wait until after (the EIS)?" The Seattle Monorail Project wants to know what the parameters are to design within so they can provide definitive design requirements for the request for proposal to contractors. The City can begin moving forward with the MUP process and apply the design guidelines during its reviews. We should have a completed schedule from SMP by July 26 or so. The Land Use Code never envisioned a Monorail structure. Are we giving away leverage? No. We're just setting parameters. John completed his discussion.

Cheryl asked if the Panel envisioned taking action and if so, could they publicly note that before discussion begins? Jack suggested the Panel take action because of the limited time we have before Council's review. If Council is relying on us for input, we should at least give them a summary of discussion if not an actual action. Jack volunteered to do the summary/action. All Panel members agreed.

### **Discussion**

- In Diane's one-page summary of code changes, it says that SDoT approves the guideway. Is that any different from how it is now, where they approve objects in the right-of-way? *When the guideway is in the right-of-way, it's similar to any other project so that it is the same (SDoT approving). However, the guideway isn't always in the r-o-w; sometimes it's on private property, which would normally fall under DCLU. This could make permit approval more complicated, with SDoT and DCLU each approving separate little bits of the guideway depending on whether or not it is in the r-o-w. We have elected to separate it into guideway (SDoT approval) and stations (DCLU approval) to make the review and permitting process more clear. DCLU also retains shoreline permitting authority.*
- When the Design Commission reviews projects in the right-of-way, SDoT actually does the permitting. There are going to be some big milestones when Council is involved in decision-making. Since it's joint permitting, if an issue arises after a Council decision, to whom do we speak if we don't like the direction something's taking? *Your information or recommendation goes to the director (of either SDoT or DCLU), and it can be appealed. Both departments issue the permits, so the MRP can also speak directly to the departments. Also, anything requiring Council action will have review by the MRP beforehand.*
- Is this analogous to (how) Light Rail (was permitted)? *Kind of, but we didn't separate the alignment and stations in the same way.*
- So this is a refinement of that process? *Yes. You'll still be reviewing design and will be an integral part of developing the design guidelines for all parts of the project.*
- Is the draft ordinance what Council is seeing tomorrow? *Yes. Is the reference regarding a waiver at the bottom of page 2 referring to the MRP? Yes.*
- We need to develop a relationship with SDoT. *Cheryl and her team are the Urban Design and Planning leads for the entire project, so much of the integration will be done through Cheryl herself. When it's relevant, you may want SDoT staff involved too.*
- Neighborhood plans also weren't created with the Monorail in mind. How many instances are there where a 65' height limit is incompatible with zoning? *Four to six; possibly a seventh.*
- There are implications regarding density of growth. *The main four areas are 65<sup>th</sup>, Dravus, Crown Hill, and Morgan Junction.*
- Do these code changes apply to the stations only? Not other development? *Yes, the height applies only to the monorail station, not to other development.*
- Is review in Pioneer Square being waived? *No, the only change is to #4 in the ordinance.*
- SMP says it can apply the recommendations we make to the actual alignment if it ends up differing from the EIS. If that's the case, why the rush? If they can do one, then why not the other? *The primary justification is to be prepared to apply for the MUP and to set design parameters in advance. Regarding whether it's necessary today as opposed to a month from now, SMP needs*

to make sure they're coordinated with the City. We have to do these code changes regardless; it sets the parameters for the project.

- So why isn't it addressed as a variance? When we know this is something that was never envisioned, we don't want to go into the Code and do a variance every time the project would exceed current zoning. If we have a facility that needs to be addressed, we take the time to look at it from the permit and review process. It's a question of timing and the pros and cons of doing it now. I think it's just a difference of opinion. We don't see it as giving away the decision-making authority. We've spent considerable time on this. We want to facilitate the process instead of coming at it from a point of tension.
- The ordinance seems very nuts & bolts: just doing what's necessary to accommodate the Monorail. I don't have any problems with it per se, but there may be other opportunities that exist with an ordinance change that we're missing because of the time crunch. Maybe transitional zoning. The change doesn't preclude that. It's within our work plan for station area planning. We'll have something to say about that by fall.
- As to the question of "why now?" I think that from a design perspective, we need to establish the parameters now. My concern is whether there's enough flexibility. (Page 4 of the summary) We're talking about 19 stations and a lot of linear footage here. Why not build in significant flexibility? In the Director's report page 1 talks about FAR limits; page 3 indicates only three stations are affected. Are you comfortable that that language is sufficiently flexible? I'd rather see more flexibility with each station reviewed on a case-by-case basis than ask for more variances down the road. It's flexible enough. We encourage (developers) to put in a building, but we're not offering bonuses. Where it's necessary to achieve Council consistency, the Director can waive or modify. Regarding height, it says that (the Monorail) CAN go higher (than current zoning) with a maximum of 65'. We hope the flexibility is built in.

At this point, Steve noted that the Panel is about five minutes over on the agenda and needs to wrap up its conversation. We should also take public comment as we're making an action.

- We haven't had anyone from SMP speak.
- Yes, we need to.
- I want to hear the public on this. I'm cognizant of the opportunities for place-making at each station. That's a station area planning issue.
- I think we should add time to this agenda item in order to hear from SMP, the public, and allow more Panel discussion based on that.
- I'm definitely concerned regarding the timing of the review/vote by Council tomorrow. A 65' height limit in some neighborhoods could really raise red flags. We know the reasons, so we need to discuss this more to make people understand that it's for flexibility reasons.
- Would someone from SMP like to address that? Well, to answer the question "why now?": the overall approach on this is that it's not an approval; it allows for flexibility. If the community doesn't want 65', they don't have to have it. It creates a framework for discussion to take place. We plan to invite each community to discuss this as soon as possible. We plan to complete the draft RFP in 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2003; issue it in 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2004 and award the contract 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2004. The objective is for the potential contractor to know what the proposal should include so there will be no going back and revising proposals later. We want to get that framework in place. With design, we're looking at survey work and geotech work. We want the design to reflect community comments. We want the first MUP applications to start in November 2003. A framework would help us know which department to apply to. This legislation does that. We could act like a developer and do a contract re-zone when necessary, but then you'd be looking at 1 to 1-1/2 years per station as opposed to five or six months.
- I'd like some clarification on the height limit: is this a conditioned exception as opposed to a blanket? Yes. Are there parameters or conditions to be approved? I would hate to see cell towers added (to the structure). We need to define the parameters. I understand the reasons (for the code changes), but I want clarification. It might allay public fears.

- When did you say the RFP would be issued? *1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2004.*
- We need certainty on this by then. *So it should go to Council for a vote at the latest sometime in September.*
- Should we form an action before taking public comment? *I want to add that it's not station design; it's more alignment design. The guideway will determine the stations; that's why we need certainty.*
- I have a question about process: will the action be advisory to City Council and if so, should we send a letter? Or is it better to have someone present at tomorrow's hearing? *Either a letter or send someone up tomorrow.*
- We need to take public comment first.

### **Public Comment**

- I still don't feel the SMP has answered questions regarding "why now?" There is no reason why they can't come up with a design now without the code amendments in place. There's no alignment, no type of equipment chosen, no design guidelines. These are permanent changes being made to neighborhoods without neighborhood or public input. These are not flexible changes. SMP is not obligated to answer the hard questions. All we are doing is requesting time for public input. This is being rushed for SMP's convenience, not for public necessity, and may bring about legislation.
- In Morgan Junction, this legislation will double the zoned height limit, so the timing is really frustrating us. We had less than one month's notice for a public meeting about this, and it doesn't help the public understand anything. It seems like you're going for the nearest average number for the height limit.
- I have a question about the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) exemption. Will everything inside downtown stations also be exempt from FAR? We don't yet have an Open Space Plan for the City of Seattle ("*we're getting there!*" -- John Rahaim), and I'm really concerned about this exemption. What will be allowed and how can we retain what open space there is in downtown? *It's not implied that any other use would be subject to the FAR exemption.*
- But going back to what Paul said (about cell towers), what can be packaged into a "Monorail facility" (as defined in the code)? *We can limit what qualifies.*

At this point, the Panel resumed discussion.

- I need to check something regarding the action – are we interested in urging Council to delay their decision?
- I think we should ask them to delay but also set a time limit for approval so it doesn't drag on. Is the end of September reasonable? *They're having another meeting September 12; September 2 and 8 will be full Council.*
- Is our concern with the ordinance focused on the increase in height?
- It seems to me there are three concerns people have: is there sufficient flexibility? What are the other two?
- If I may interrupt – if you're including my concern in those three, it was answered by John. Item #5 gives the Director of DCLU/SDoT discretion.
- Okay, so the second would be clarity on what can be packaged. Clarity is lacking with respect to how "Monorail facility" is defined.
- Also, this code amendment isn't an approval; it sets criteria. There will still be a lengthy approval process. *There is a definition that might help make this clearer. Waivers are for Monorail Transit Facilities, which are defined on page 10. We've discussed this with Martha Lester, Council Central Staff, who says it needs to be more specific. Martha is bringing language that clarifies a facility as having direct association with the operation of the Monorail.*
- Regarding FAR: on lines 17, 18 & 19 it talks about excluding retail or service establishments. I think other things should be excluded. *That's only to clarify that it should be specific to the Monorail;*

*e.g. an espresso cart -- we wouldn't want to have to calculate it for that. But a retail facility would not be exempt.*

- So . . . it seems that some Panel members advocate for delay and others do not. Can I get some help in framing an action?
- The primary question seems to be whether or not the decision on code amendments should be delayed.
- Well, my concerns are allayed. It seems like this is just a framework and there will still be a lot of review on each station. We should pass this on up to the City Council and let them know the community's desire for more time for public input.
- I agree with Mimi. Delaying won't change anything, but the neighborhoods will feel heard. I'm happy with the language.
- I'll admit I'm somewhat ignorant of the plan approval process. I'm concerned about this when we don't even know OUR (MRP) schedule. I say bring this back to us once there's a MRP schedule prepared.
- I feel the same way. Our (MRP) needs come first. There will be lots of abstaining on actions until we have the opportunity to review this and have a handle on it. I don't know how the dates SMP has given us make sense in the big picture.
- I've read the ordinance and I agree with Mimi. It's just a nuts & bolts thing to allow the Monorail to be built. However, I'm just as concerned with the SMP schedule and how it all fits with our review. Until we know the SMP review and permitting schedule, it's hard to know what else fits. Even if this is passed immediately, it's still not going to be quick enough for SMP to be efficient and cost-effective. I'm more aligned with Mimi: Council should do what it can to provide the community more of an opportunity to be heard.
- The Monorail is being described as an "essential public facility" – that's what it should be. In Kobe and Vancouver the elevated trains provide each city with opportunities to get more out of it than just transportation.
- *You're discussing this as if it's all or nothing. Are these separable issues?*
- This is one tough action!
- What's the final language? *Martha is bringing the latest version of the proposed code amendments for Council approval at the hearing tomorrow.*
- Okay, I will try an action.

Jack began an action but more discussion ensued regarding whether to include information about MRP's lack of a schedule from SMP; whether or not to insert specific dates vis a vis accommodating both the public and SMP. It was decided that references to MRP's lack of a SMP schedule would not be included, and that the language of the time allotted for public input and Council deliberation would remain open, the point being that since the Panel has no SMP schedule it can't place dated limits on any recommendations.

### **Action**

**The Panel thanks DCLU staff for their presentation on the proposed Land Use Code amendments, and appreciates the comments made by staff, the Seattle Monorail Project (SMP) and members of the public. We understand and recognize the necessity for the code amendments as they seem reasonable in scope and detail. However, we are concerned about the speed at which these code amendments are being processed. Members of the public have indicated that there has not been sufficient time for the public to understand how these amendments may affect their community. The Seattle Monorail Project has indicated it is necessary to implement this legislation now to meet its own schedule for design and community expectations. However, the SMP has not yet provided the Panel with an overall schedule for the design and implementation of the monorail project. Without knowing how these amendments affect the overall schedule for the SMP, the MRP's review and the larger**

**review of City Council, the Panel recommends further consideration and deliberation of the issues and impacts related to this legislation, including inclusion of community concerns, prior to a City Council decision. We believe it may be possible to extend the schedule into September as needed without jeopardizing the SMP project schedule, and therefore urge the Council to consider giving more time to the process.**

Cary seconded the motion and it passed unanimously with no abstentions. Maureen will write the letter to Council and Steve will sign it. Staff can present it at tomorrow's 2:00 hearing.

## **Seattle Center Visual Simulations**

*Alan Hart, SMP*

*Suanne Pelley, SMP*

*Roxanne Williams, NBBJ*

Suanne Pelley introduced the presentation. SMP staff feels they can cut their presentation to half an hour to accommodate the Bicycle Planning segment as the meeting is running past schedule.

The simulations represent the two most likely northwest routes: through Seattle Center and along Mercer. Roxanne is the lead architect for the Seattle Center segment, and will be bringing this information to Bumbershoot.

Roxanne Williams from NBBJ led the presentation. We are trying to look at each approach fairly. We'll be showing you the differences, the impact of the column feet, and the 3-D visualizations. The northwest route will either link two systems through the Center or go around the edge of the Center via Mercer.

### **Heart of Seattle (Seattle Center Route)**

The "Heart of Seattle" represents four months of research; the goals and aspirations of stakeholders are evidenced here. The different perspectives show guideway supports at 45' above grade at the top of the alignment to 60' above grade at the back of the fountain. This is to accommodate defining view corridors.

We have some verified and unverified assumptions. We know the size and location of each support column for each potential alignment. We have no column design yet, although we're focusing on two choices and others are being discussed. The exact location where the train will transition from side-by-side to vertical has not been determined yet. We did a walkthrough with a Landscape Architect and the Seattle Center Horticulturist in order to accurately show which trees will be removed and which will be re-planted (pictured at 10 years of growth). The trees on the south side won't be affected. The view of the fountain was deemed "sacred" by stakeholders, so we've been looking at how column placement and guideway height will affect the view. The train length is accurate, whether we decide on two cars or three. The total length is not affected. We want to maintain a 60' height around the fountain (the climb begins at the Northwest Rooms), as shown in the 3-D visualizations of the NW route.

### **City-Defining Streets (Mercer Route)**

Our goal here is to show how the streets will be improved by the Monorail, not its negative impacts. As we approach the turn onto Mercer, we'll need a bent for the curve from Warren to Mercer. We're at 40' above grade here. The back of the column will abut the edge of the sidewalk, so we'll be losing about 8' of curb. Fortunately, the lanes on Mercer are very wide so we can accommodate that loss. The north side of the sidewalk will be expanded. We'll screen the base of the garage with vines to



mitigate the necessary removal of trees. The turn from Mercer to 5<sup>th</sup> requires two bents from the median across to the west side. We're trying to avoid the additional complication of grade separation.

We'll be keeping the trees in the center of the road and the trees on the eastern side. Here, the upper guideway is at 45' and the lower is at 35'.

Because we haven't yet chosen the train technology, in order to accommodate the Panel's request the train pictured here is a fictional hybrid of the two train models we're calling the "Bombachi!" Per your request, we also rendered the guideway more grey (as opposed to lighter white in earlier drawings), and showed the view down Republican. A reporter has requested to see these, so we're really anxious to hear Panel comments.

### Discussion

- Well, we're not taking action on this one, so let's just hear Panel comments.
- The Chair asks for someone to record a summary. (Cary volunteers)
- The bents will have a big impact on the street. The northwest alignment through Seattle Center won't need them? *No. In that northwest route there's nothing we can't do with columns.*
- What are the tech requirements? *We're picking up the load in a bent.*
- Going back to Nick Licata and Peter Steinbrueck's letter—we're not talking about the route itself today, right? Just the simulations? *Yes.*
- Well, thanks for the changes. We had requested the view of Republican be shown from the back of Pacific NW Ballet. We also need to see a video. *That's in the process of being made.* Okay, but I'm not sure the intent (of the letter and the Panel's previous action) has been met. We may need to make an action again today to clarify what we want. *We have contracted with a firm and taken ground shots (for the video production). Unfortunately, this type of simulation doesn't lend itself to quick turnaround. We're definitely working on both.*
- Will there be audio with the video? *There will be some audio. Alan can talk about the timing. We're using movie technology but trying to apply it to Urban Design/Architecture. We want to do it right. We'll definitely stay in touch with staff.*
- Will it be ready in time for Bumbershoot? *Yes, it should be done about three weeks from now.*
- With the bents: is this the actual design or just an estimation? We don't have a design for either the columns or the train yet, so we're showing two different things in the simulations. *The parameters follow basic rules of thumb based on the sizes we've discussed. As we get closer (to EIS approval?) you'll see the actual thing.*
- There are some really soft soils there; putting a 4' square column on the ground may be misleading. Will the alignment be on the west or east side of 5<sup>th</sup>? *Oh, that's an error (in one simulation) of the side of the street and the bents. The line drawings are correct.*
- What's the underlying zoning at Seattle Center? 65'. So if the track is 65' high, is that at the bottom of the guideway or the top? *The top. The stations would be lower? Yes.*
- We'd discussed the use of the iris in downtown only. If we need ¼ mile transition between a split and side-by-side guideway, would we keep the split throughout? *We'll need somewhere between 300' and 500'. If the station is in the right-of-way, it's effectively the same height. We're looking at having a transition on 5<sup>th</sup>.*
- But if we go to a split vertical at EMP, do we go back to side-by-side at Belltown?
- The Chair reminds the panel to keep our discussion to the simulations.
- Can we have a copy of the goals? *Yes; we need to make some corrections first.*
- I think these are nice simulations.
- Is this it? Or will we see simulations of the section by the Center House? *Five were commissioned; the one you mention was requested today. It will be included in the video.*
- If the analysis of the two potential routes is to be unbiased, I must ask that you remove the title on the "Heart of Seattle" piece. I think it is definitely biased. "Heart of Seattle" sounds much better

than "City-defined Streets." That's an alignment issue, not a simulation issue, and I want the simulations to be unbiased.

### **Summary**

The Panel thanks SMP and NBBJ for coming and presenting the changes made to the photo simulations, especially the new ones we requested. We find them more realistic, thorough, and informative than the initial images. We look forward to seeing the video, which will be a critical partner piece toward helping laypeople visualize the alternatives. We request that you remove or perhaps replace the subtitles with a more straightforward explanation.

Jack seconded, and while no official action or vote was required, the summary was met with general nodding of heads by the Panel.

### **Bike Planning**

*Rachel Ben-Shmuel, SMP*

*Grace Kim, Place Architects*

*Heather Johnston, Place Architects*

Rachel introduced Grace and Heather and the bike planning process. Place Architects has prepared detailed architectural plans, and is looking at system-wide bicycle access. They've talked to a lot of biking groups (representing different types of cyclists). SMP doesn't want bike planning to be an afterthought. By addressing these concerns, they also addressed issues related to strollers and wheelchairs. Grace and Heather begin their presentation by asking the Panel to excuse their limited graphics and chalk it up to their timeline being quicker than that of some of the other consultants for SMP.

The four main concerns of the Bicycle Advisory Board and others are: bike access on trains; safe routes and station access; ridership; and bike storage at stations. Place has researched 17 other systems across the country, focusing only on systems in the US. With respect to bike access on trains, we have gotten direct user feedback and are talking to "everyone." Specific concerns included whether or not a fee would be charged, and what type of bike storage would exist in the cars themselves.

Safe routes and station access: We've looked at existing bike usage maps with an overlay of the Green Line, including a four- to six-block radius around the stations. We looked at issues and opportunities at each station (topographical challenges, traffic conflicts) and will probably propose different layers of service per station. We're currently doing scientific analysis as well.

Ridership estimation: We've been using the Monorail data and extrapolating bike user information, including local historical data and national statistics. If we get more cyclists, we include more area in the non-car radius. We are working with the Cascade Design Collaborative (CDC) on individual neighborhoods, checking their own number-crunching with CDC's assessments.

The results of an online survey yielded responses primarily from cyclists, but from other potential users, too. They received 700 responses in two weeks to questions like, "Where do you live"; "Would you ride your bike to the Monorail?"; "Would you take your bike on the Monorail?"; and "Would you store it at a Monorail station?"

We're also talking to Metro and Link Light Rail about making connections, e.g. at the ends of the bus tunnel. We need to determine how to interface all types of bike riders. We have the survey results if you'd like them.

### **Discussion**

- The Chair asks the Panel for a volunteer to craft the summary. (Paul volunteers)
- I'd encourage you to look at other countries as well – we want to do something better than what we've already done here. *We are looking at other international examples, but we're using US numbers.*
- The cyclists who would use Monorail are usually die-hards or marginal users. I think you should focus on the marginal users. Listen to them – those who might otherwise not ride, but would if Monorail made it accessible.
- Since Ralph's not here, I just want to say for him: Thank you!! This is really important, because there is little or no parking in some of the station areas. Maybe they could build bike storage into the columns. Which areas will have the most bike ridership? Make sure you check out bike/pedestrian conflicts as well (gave Light Rail Lander example); be aware of that. I also advocate a trip to Amsterdam – don't discount anything outside the US.
- Are there any scope-related questions? Are you looking at the greater station area and informing station area planning? *That's tricky. It's sort of SDoT, sort of CDC, and sort of an urban design team issue.*
- Will your work be done before station area planning? *They're tracking the bike through the station. Place is coordinating with others and looking at it from the standpoint of riders. The urban fabric information that's gathered will be made available to the City Monorail team.*
- Some of the design teams have talked about removing the bike lane on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; will you have input on that? *Yes, just recently we did. We're doing research on it (history, analysis, alternatives) and others, too. Even if it's not used much, it's the only bike lane going through downtown so we want to look at that.*
- What about getting the bikes up to the stations? Will they all have elevators? *We'll deal with that systematically. We'll try to standardize it. The (ADA) elevators will be big enough to accommodate bikes but presumably there will be etiquette among users.*
- Is it within your scope to determine a sufficient budget? *No. We'll define the program first, then storage. If there's more space on the vehicle, more will be taken on the vehicle. A lot of it is operational costs; a lot of it is storage costs.*
- Regarding 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: it's important how the questions are asked. If it's a matter of yes/no (should the bike lane be removed), the answer will be obvious. *2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is tricky.*
- What about the less intrepid cyclists? There's a lot of potential to access parks, etc. Is that within your scope? *Well, Heather and I actually come from differing viewpoints (I'm more casual; she's more die-hard), so we've been exploring it from both angles. Looking for ridership opportunities is within our scope. We're looking at tourism, too: marketing, ridership, and education. The commuter is the best countable number.*
- Bike and Monorail routes intersect in some places; some are inconsistent. You're probably aware of that if you're an avid cyclist, but I'm hoping you look at some opportunities for improvement.

### **Summary**

The Panel thanks Place Architects for the presentation and the introduction to the bike component of the Monorail alignment. We encourage you to look outside of the US for examples, and look at promoting ridership among marginal riders. Also, please take a creative approach to looking for opportunities for storage in and around the stations. We'd also like you to look carefully at possible conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists, and think as broadly as possible around stations to inform station area planning.

## Discussion: Future Items for Panel Review

- Have we already determined our meetings agenda items for August 4th? *The schedule, definitely.*
- We need to have a final agenda four to five days before a meeting.
- Where do we stand off and let design move forward (clarification of Ethan's memo)? *That's dependent on the schedule.*
- Cary brought up a good point about the clumsiness of the first action. Cary?
- I think we need a tape recorder. *Yes, we'll bring one next time.*

Steve stated that Don will be gone for the next meeting too. He and I want to meet with staff between MRP meetings; if any of you (Panel members) have agenda items for us to bring up, please e-mail them to me or Don. When we talk about issues of geographical significance (e.g. West Seattle or Ballard), we've considered having the meetings in that particular area. Cheryl observed that with respect to future agenda items, because you are all so thorough, it's hard to imagine that you would be comfortable simply "skimming" an issue. Nonetheless, the Panel is also limited in the amount of time it has to review the project. This raises the question of whether Panel members want to review fewer items in greater detail, or more items in less detail.

- What we need is a schedule! (general enthusiastic agreement) I would appreciate a discussion of why Dravus and Mercer were chosen instead of two very different locations.
- I think they were chosen because they have less neighborhood or urban impact.
- I suggest we send a letter to SMP asking those questions without needing it to be on the agenda.
- Yes, some smaller issues can be kicked into conversation via e-mail. (general request for limited e-mail dialogue)
- Once you have a schedule, there may be other ways to handle your workload.
- Next time, are we meeting at 4:00? *It hasn't been decided yet. The Panel definitely prefers longer (three-hour) meetings over more meetings, but a time was never decided. Options are 3:00 to 6:00, 3:30 to 6:30, or 4:00 to 7:00.*
- For August 4, let's stick to a two-hour meeting, from 4:00 to 6:00. *Well, that will depend on what's on the agenda.*
- For the second time, I'd like to request smaller copies of the presentation materials from the consultants.
- Will our schedule be integrated with Council's? Like in an Excel spreadsheet? *All review entities' schedules will be included.*

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.